

# APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

OMB Approval No. 0348-0043

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction		2. DATE SUBMITTED May 12, 2000		Applicant Identifier N/A	
		3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE N/A		State Application Identifier N/A	
		4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY		Federal Identifier	
5. APPLICANT INFORMATION					
Legal Name: COMMITTEE FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE				Organizational Unit:	
Address (give city, county, State, and zip code): 406 Main Street, Suite 313 Watsonville, CA 95076				Name and telephone number of person to be contacted on matters involving this application (give area code): Lynn Young (831) 763-2111	
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): 68-0003547				7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: (enter appropriate letter in box)	
8. N P E OF APPLICATION: <input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision If Revision, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A. Increase Award E. Decrease Award C. Increase Duration D. Decrease Duration Other (specify):				A. State H. Independent School Dist. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	
				B. County I. State Controlled Institution of Higher Learning C. Municipal J. Private University D. Township K. Indian Tribe E. Interstate L. Individual F. Intermunicipal M. Profit Organization G. Special District N. Other (Specify) <u>Non-Profit</u> 501 (c) 3	
				9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY: CALFED	
10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER: XXXX-XXXX TITLE N/A				11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT: Environmental Stewardship and Educational Conferences and Tours to address the impact of agriculture production and landscape management on Bay-Delta Ecozones	
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (Cities, Counties, States, etc.): Napa, Madera, Fresno, Stanislaus, Alameda, Santa Clara, CA					
13. PROPOSED PROJECT		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:			
Start Date 11/1/00	Ending Date 10/31/00	a. Applicant 17th District		b. Project Districts: 1, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20	
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS?			
a. Federal	\$ 97,000 .00	a. YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE <u>May 12, 2000</u>			
b. Applicant	\$ .00	b. No. <input type="checkbox"/> PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372 <input type="checkbox"/> OR PROGRAM HAS NOT BEEN SELECTED BY STATE FOR REVIEW			
c. State	\$ .00	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Yes," attach an explanation. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
d. Local	\$ .00				
e. Other	\$ .00				
f. Program Income	\$ .00				
g. TOTAL	\$ 97,000 .00				
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.					
a. Type Name of Authorized Representative Lynn Young		b. Title Executive Director		c. Telephone Number (831) 763-2111	
d. Signature of Authorized Representative				e. Date Signed May 12, 2000	

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF-424

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0043), Washington, DC 20503.

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.**

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

- | Item:  | Entry:   |
|--|--|
| 1. Self-explanatory.   | 12. List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities).   |
| 2. Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) and applicant's control number (if applicable).   | 13. Self-explanatory.  |
| 3. State use only (if applicable).   | 14. List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project.  |
| 4. If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank.   | 15. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate <u>only</u> the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15. |
| 5. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application.  | 16. Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process.  |
| 6. Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.   | 17. This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.  |
| 7. Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided.   | 18. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)  |
| 8. Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:<br><br>-- "New" means a new assistance award.<br><br>-- "Continuation" means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.<br><br>-- "Revision" means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation. |  |
| 9. Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.  |  |
| 10. Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.  |  |
| 11. Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real properly projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.  |  |

Proposal # **2001- I207** (Office Use Only)

**PSP Cover Sheet** (Attach to the front of each proposal)

Proposal Title: Environmental Stewardship Educational Conferences and Tours  
Applicant Name: Lynn Youna on behalf of Committee for Sustainable Agriculture  
Contact Name: Lynn Young  
Mailing Address: 406 Main Street, Suite 313, Watsonville, CA 95076  
Telephone: (831) 763-2111  
Fax: (831) 763-2112  
Email: csaefc@csa-efc.org

Amount of funding requested: \$ 97,000

Some entities charge different costs dependent on the source of the funds. If it is different for state or federal funds list below.

State cost \_\_\_\_\_ Federal cost \_\_\_\_\_

**Cost share partners?**

\_\_\_\_ Yes ☒ No

Identify partners and amount contributed by each \_\_\_\_\_

**Indicate the Topic for which you are applying (check only one box).**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Flow Regimes                | <input type="checkbox"/> Beyond the Riparian Corridor                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nonnative Invasive Species          | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Watershed Stewardship                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Channel Dynamics/Sediment Transport | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Education          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Flood Management                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Status Species Surveys and Studies  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shallow Water Tidal/ Marsh Habitat  | <input type="checkbox"/> Fishery Monitoring, Assessment and Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contaminants                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Fish Screens                                |

What county or counties is the project located in? Napa, Madera, Fresno, Stanislaus, Alameda, Santa Clara

What CALFED ecozone is the project located in? See attached list and indicate number. Be as specific as possible 2 & 13

**Indicate the type of applicant (check only one box):**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State agency                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal agency        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public/Non-profit joint venture | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-profit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local government/district       | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribes                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> University                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Private party         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                    |  |

**Indicate the primary species which the proposal addresses (check all that apply):**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin and East-side Delta tributaries fall-run chinook salmon | <input type="checkbox"/> Spring-run chinook salmon           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Winter-run chinook salmon  | <input type="checkbox"/> Fall-run chinook salmon             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Late-fall run chinook salmon   | <input type="checkbox"/> Longfin smelt                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta smelt  | <input type="checkbox"/> Steelhead trout                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Splittail  | <input type="checkbox"/> Striped bass                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Green sturgeon   | <input type="checkbox"/> All chinook species                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> White Sturgeon   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All anadromous salmonids |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Waterfowl and Shorebirds   | <input type="checkbox"/> American shad                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Migratory birds   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other listed T/E species: _____  |  |

**Indicate the type of project (check only one box):**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research/Monitoring       | <input type="checkbox"/> Watershed Planning   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pilot/Demo Project        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Full-scale Implementation |   |

Is this a next-phase of an ongoing project? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X  
Have you received funding from CALFED before? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, list project title and CALFED number Environmental Agriculture Conference & Field Tours 9-FC-20-00010

Have you received funding from CVPIA before? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

If yes, list CVPIA program providing funding, project title and CVPIA number (if applicable):  
\_\_\_\_\_

**By signing below, the applicant declares the following:**

- The truthfulness of all representations in their proposal;
- The individual signing the form is entitled to submit the application on behalf of the applicant (if the applicant is an entity or organization); and
- The person submitting the application has read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality discussion in the PSP (Section 2.4) and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent as provided in the Section.

Lynn Young

Printed name of applicant

  
Signature of applicant

## **B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Environmental Stewardship Education Conferences & Tours: Addressing the Impacts of Farm & Landscape Management Decisions on Bay-Delta Ecozones**

Amount Requested: One to four conferences for one to two years. Each conference requires \$12,125; four events require \$48,500, and eight \$97,000.

Applicant Name:

**Lynn** Young  
Committee for Sustainable Agriculture  
406 Main St., Suite 313  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
(831) 763-2111  
(831) 763-2112 fax  
csa.efc@csa-efc.org

Collaborators: Napa Resource Conservation District, Napa Sustainable Winegrape Growing Group, Napa Valley Vintner's Association, Natural Resources Conservation Service in Madera/Fresno Counties, California Clean Growers, Natural Resources Conservation Service in Stanislaus County, Community Alliance with Family Farmers, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

The Committee for Sustainable Agriculture (CSA) proposes four conservation conferences and tours (per year for two years) that address the needs and areas of 1) Winegrape growers in the Napa County/ Suisun Marsh/North San Francisco Bay ecozone, 2) Winegrape growers in Madera and Fresno Counties/ East San Joaquin Basin, 3) Landscape professionals in Stanislaus County/ East San Joaquin Basin, and 4) Landscape professionals in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties/ impacting Suisun Marsh/North San Francisco Bay ecozone. These events will present conservation practices that mitigate production decisions and thereby reduce water pollution and soil erosion from agriculture and landscape operations. The hypotheses being tested is: Attending the conferences will raise awareness of conference participants, impacting their attitudes and related farm or landscape water quality management practices. Exposure to and knowledge of sustainable strategies will stimulate conference attendees to reduce non-point source pollution of persistent organo-chlorine and non-persistent pesticides and fertilizers, and to lessen sedimentation of fish gravel beds and river turbidity.

## **C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **1. Statement of the Problem**

#### **a. Problem**

The Bay-Delta, largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas, is home to 750 species of plants and animals, and supplies drinking water to two-thirds of Californians (White, 1999). Over 7 million acres of farmland are irrigated with its waters, creating a richness and bounty of food products and an ecologically compromising situation of decreased species diversity and diminished water quality.

#### **Current winegrape management issues**

The current market for winegrapes can result in profits as high as \$4,000 per acre of vineyard land in full production. High returns are fueling the industry to expand. The California wine crop value tripled its worth in just eight years, with a return of \$2.1 billion in 1996 (White, 1999). Native vegetation communities such as valley-foothill riparian forests, oak woodlands, vernal pools and wetlands are being lost due to vineyard conversion. Many of these communities are located on hillsides historically considered marginal for agriculture due to slope, drainage, or poor soil. Conversions are having adverse impacts to diverse fish and wildlife resources.

#### **Winegrape management in Napa County**

Winegrape practices are effecting the Napa River through the destruction of native plant communities due to vineyard expansion and Pierce's disease, and applications of pesticides. Converting oak woodlands to vineyards are long-term land use changes causing generally permanent wildlife and fishery impacts. Approximately 5-10% of the 1000-2000 streambed alteration permits (Fish and Game Code sections 1600-1607) processed annually by DFG's Central Coast Region involve vineyard development where water quality and downstream sedimentation are issues. Steelhead trout and Coho salmon in the Central and North coasts are adversely affected from instream sedimentation (CON, 2000). A small patch of forest provides thousands of trees, bushes, grasses and weeds that all act to hold topsoil in place during winter storms. Removal of the vegetation results in a tremendous increase in downstream runoff.

Pierce's disease, carried by the blue-green sharpshooter, is motivating growers adjacent to riparian areas to destroy the insect's alternate host plant species. Removal of native vegetation is resulting in increasing water temperatures due to less shading from the tree and shrub canopies. In Napa County, winegrapes are both the top valued crop and the top user of pesticides. Over 2.5 million pounds of pesticides were used on winegrapes in 1998, and although the majority of these are applications are sulfur, the impact of pesticides is apparent. During a high outflow that followed major January storms in 1997, aquatic toxicity of the Napa River was documented (Ogle et al., 1998).

#### **Winegrape management in Madera and Fresno Counties**

The environmentally sensitive watersheds of the Chowchilla, San Joaquin and Kings Rivers are impacted by practices used to produce winegrapes in Madera and Fresno Counties. Winegrapes pesticide applications totaled 9 million pounds in Madera and Fresno Counties in 1998 (CDPR, 2000). Toxic concentrations of sprays are routinely detected in surface waters of the San Joaquin River Basin (CVRWQCB, 1995). As much as 10 tons of topsoil per acre are eroded in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley (MB, 1997), with much of it silting up waterways and leaving active chemicals buried at the bottom of rivers (MB, 1998). A uniform band of selenium soil contamination twists and bends from south of Bakersfield to just north of Los Banos, with counts ranging from 5 to

200 ppb (Harris, 1991). Over irrigation and the resultant runoff of these farms along this band induces selenium to move into waterways.

#### Need for Winegrape education

The proposed *Winegrape Conferences and Tours* are designed to fill a clearly demonstrated need for education and application of more sustainable techniques. Establishing vineyard setbacks from streams, planting cover strips and revegetating riparian areas with native species makes vineyards part of the agroecosystem. Habitat diversification can favor natural enemies. In the case of a leafhopper species, when French prune refuges are planted upwind from a vineyard, they enhance the natural parasite's activity to attack the pest (Pickett and Bugg, 1998). Spiders, natural enemies of insect pests in grape vineyards (Roltshchik et al., 1998), can be encouraged by increasing habitat with native plant species. Habitat management in general can enhance biological control of insect pests by providing multiple environmental requirements to beneficial insects, including: 1) supplementary foods (alternate hosts or prey, or in some cases pollen); 2) complementary foods (honeydew, pollen, nectar); 3) modified climate (e.g., windbreaks,); or 4) overwintering or nesting habitat (Pickett and Bugg, 1998).

#### Current landscape management issues

In the U.S., about eight million households use a commercial lawn care service (Benbrook et al., 1996). Consumers spent more than a billion dollars for pest management services to treat lawns and deal with other pests. and purchased almost \$400 million of pesticide products in 1995 (ACPA, 1996). In California, 73 million pounds of herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides are used in homes and gardens each year (EPA, 1993). Lawn care products and formulations applied by lawn care companies tend to be mixtures of fertilizer and herbicides, insecticides and sometimes fungicides, and many of these applications are only marginally useful. Alarming, recent studies are associating increased incidents of cancers and leukemia in children with prolonged exposure to in-home pesticide use (Fenske, et al., 1990) (Davis, et al., 1993) (Leiss, et al., 1995). Studies also indicate that trout and salmon species are particularly sensitive to some pesticides. The neuroendocrine system of the fish is adversely affected and triggers markedly depressed immune responses (Grier et al., 1994).

#### Landscape management in Stanislaus County

Stanislaus County contains many environmentally sensitive watersheds impacted by landscape management, including the Tuolumne and San Joaquin Rivers. Runoff and eroded soils containing sediment-borne contaminants are modifying riparian and aquatic ecosystems. Landscapers in Stanislaus County applied 19,000 pounds of pesticides in 1998 (CDPR). Thirteen pesticides have been detected in the San Joaquin River at levels in excess of US EPA and CA Department of Fish and Game Hazard Assessment recommended criteria. (CVRWQCB, 1990 & 95).

#### Landscape management in Santa Clara and Alameda Counties

Santa Clara and Alameda Counties' landscapers and gardeners impact the environmentally sensitive eastern and southern reaches of the San Francisco Estuary and Bay-Delta. Use of pesticides by landscape pest control operators, which does not include household consumers, totaled over 165,000 pounds, making this industry the second and third biggest pesticide user in the counties, respectively (CDPR). In the Oakland Harbor, fish were found with elevated concentrations of DDT, chlordane, and dieldrin. While these pesticides are not currently used, they are persistent and adhere to sediments eroded from unprotected landscapes. Due to the high detected levels, a health advisory for consumers of locally caught fish was posted, and concern is mounting for the health of the Bay fisheries. Many pesticide active ingredients are toxic to aquatic organisms and

fish even in the low parts-per-billion range, and sensitivity to pesticides is much greater in young organisms (Mayer and Ellersieck, 1986).

The proposed *Landscape Conferences and Tours* are designed address the need for education in urban-based conservation practices. As agricultural farmland is replaced by urban development, there is a growing acknowledgement of the vital role of landscapes, parks, and gardens in providing aesthetic and recreational respite, and in supplying clean water, wildlife habitats, and vegetative cover which can stabilize slopes and protect delicate watersheds. Escalating urbanization is creating a booming growth in the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers by landscape professionals, with attendant risks to the environment and human health. To address the needs of urban landscapers, comprehensive presentations will cover research and applications in biological control, composts, native plant varieties, xeriscaping, water conservation, and habitat restoration.

### **Managing along a continuum**

Farm and landscape management exists in almost infinite forms, ranging from highly dependent chemical pesticide and fertilizer systems, with little irrigation efficacy or erosion control measures to those systems that rarely require agrochemicals or have off-site aggradation of waterways. These practices fall along a continuum:

#### **No to Low Integrated Pest Management (E'') & Conservation Measures**

System is essentially dependent on agrochemicals, with little or no insect scouting, irrigation monitoring, or erosion control,

#### **Medium IPM & Conservation Measures**

System in which growers and landscapers have adopted some preventative measures and have made an effort to cut back on agrochemicals, and track off-site drainage,

#### **High Bio Intensive IPM & Conservation Measures**

This is the system farthest along the continuum, where growers and landscapers have integrated multiple preventive practices and as a result, have become able to control pests, and fertilize and irrigate crops without impacting downstream waters.

The objective of these conferences is to change farmers and landscape managers attitudes and subsequent practices by presenting the following conservation strategies:

- reduce off-site impacts of organo-chlorine pesticide laden soils and diminish chronic fish health effects from non-persistent pesticides by increasing biointensive Integrated Pest Management techniques, such as monitoring insect populations, conducting disease forecasting, rotating crops, and supporting natural enemies with annual flowering plants interspersed in market crops,
- mitigate the sedimentation of fish gravel beds and river turbidity by increasing erosion control measures, such as using annual and perennial plant covers, conservation buffer strips, sediment basins, water energy dissipaters, and stream bank stabilization,
- lessen fertilizer impacts and selenium contamination on waterways and natural habitats by improving irrigation efficiency and optimizing water use,
- conserve and increase migratory bird habitat diversity by planting native hedgerows that support beneficial insects, and windbreak species along riparian areas
- increase quality of drinking water in the Bay-Delta system by above practices.

### **b. Conceptual model**

In order to assess the proposed conferences, conceptual models of how farmers and landscape managers make decisions to change their practices are presented (Figure 1, 2, & 3). These models show key points of when and how farm and landscape management decisions are made, and mitigations that diminish their resource-intensive practices. In the course of defining the conceptual model for improving the conference effectiveness



(Figure 3), we realized that the evaluation form conference participants fill out should be expanded. Past evaluations have queried what new practices learned at the conference will be tried. In order to further assess effectiveness, the evaluation will now include what current practices are employed for pest, fertilizer, irrigation, and erosion control in the continuum of management. A fourth conceptual model was developed for the process of assessing and improving the conference's effectiveness Figure 4).

#### **c. Hypotheses being tested**

**Null:** Attending the conferences will have no impact on the attitudes and related farm or landscape water quality management practices of conference participants.

**Alternative:** Attending the conferences will raise awareness of conference participants, impacting their attitudes and related farm or landscape water quality management practices.

#### **d. Adaptive management**

The conceptual models of impacting grower decisions, and producing effective conferences, explicitly show that full-scale implementation of the events will result in the educational objective. Figure 4 represents graphically the decision nodes in the process of planning, producing and assessing the conferences.

#### **e. Educational objectives**

The Ecosystem Restoration Project goals of improving and increasing aquatic and terrestrial habitats, and ecological functions in the Bay-Delta will be addressed through the listed objective. Off-site impacts of pesticide laden soils and water will be reduced by increasing knowledge of biointensive Integrated Pest Management techniques. Sedimentation of gravel beds and river turbidity will be diminished by increasing access to information on erosion control measures. Fertilizer and selenium contamination of waterways and natural habitats will be improved by providing facts on increased irrigation efficiency. Migratory bird habitat diversity will increase by increasing knowledge of plantings native hedgerows that support beneficial insects.

CSA's conference and tour methodology employs comprehensive farmer or landscaper scientist focus sessions that combine systematic workshops and panel discussions with tours and on-site presentations:

1) Expert presentations and facilitated discussions allow participants to explore state-of-the-art material and research on agriculture and landscape conservation technologies. The in-house program includes plenary sessions presenting general, broad-range information as well as breakout workshops that address particular crops and specific production practices representative of each region.

2) Tour sessions allow an exchange of applied knowledge and practical experience between growers and conference participants. On-site farmer or landscaper presentations and facilitated question and answer periods provide a direct forum for peer counseling and strategizing, and encourage the exchange of information between diverse groups. Additionally, these on-farm sessions increase the likelihood of farmers attending the events.

Conference attendees **also** receive course packets that include current popular and research articles relating to each session and presenter, handouts from educational cooperators, appropriate resource directories, and a participants' directory for further

information exchange. Qualifying individuals will receive Department of Pesticide Regulation continuing education units and Certified Crop Advisor credits.

The principal target audiences for these conservation events are farmers and landscapers and their consultants. More than 100 people are anticipated to attend each of the eight conferences. Historically, 50% of attendees are farmers or landscapers, and an additional 30% are advisors. These are the people capable of affecting practices that will conserve natural resources and mitigate impacts of agriculture on the environment. The remaining audience is comprised of industry-related businesses, students, researchers, and the general public. By providing both general conservation information and more specific technical information, these conferences and farm tours are accessible to a wide range of audiences. A small but significant number of participants at these events are interested individuals who wish to learn more about environmental and agriculture issues in their community. The inclusion of tours to local sustainable farms, landscapes, and facilities during these conferences helps form a network of resources that can be used by diverse constituencies to further local conservation efforts. Outreach through mainstream media ensures that the widest audience of people is invited to participate and learn from these educational forums.

**Outreach** In addition to outreach through CSA's extensive mailing list of farmers, advisors, and businesses, these conferences are promoted through similar organizations mailing lists, newsletters, and media announcements, including Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF), California Certified Organic Farmers and Farm Bureau newsletters, local newspapers, and UC SAREP's and Small Farm Center's web pages. "Word of mouth" outreach also plays a significant part in reaching target audiences as growers, landscapers and crop advisors who have attended prior CSA conferences share their enthusiasm for these events with their peers.

The evaluation methodology is described below in 2.c. Assessment Plans.

## **2. Proposed Scope of Work**

### **a. Location**

The geographic regions to be addressed in the Bay-Delta area include all winegrape acreage that impacts Napa and Petaluma Rivers, Sonoma Creek, and their tributaries; all winegrape acreage that impacts the San Joaquin and Chowchilla Rivers; all landscaped areas in Santa Clara and Alameda that impact the San Francisco Estuary, and all landscaped areas that impact the San Joaquin River, and Stanislaus, Merced, and Tuolumne tributaries. No geographic coordinates are provided for the proposed educational events because they will not have a project footprint, but rather will have a widespread influence on large bioregions.

The conferences are in or impact the following ecozones:

- 1) Winegrape: Suisun Marsh/North San Francisco Bay
- 2) Winegrape: East San Joaquin Basin
- 3) Landscape: areas impacting Suisun Marsh/North San Francisco Bay
- 4) Landscape: East San Joaquin Basin

### **b. Approach**

The basic premise upon which CSAs conferences are founded is that changing knowledge and attitudes leads to changes in behavior. By hearing about environmentally sound agricultural practices, conference attendees should become more aware of how their practices impact non-source watershed pollution from their crop and landscape management strategies and become more willing to change their practices. Our post-conference evaluations attempt to measure intent to use this new knowledge.

The evaluation surveys: the impact of the conference on attendee knowledge, plans to change farming practices as a result of what was learned and the attendees satisfaction with the event. CSA asks the participants to complete the questionnaire and turn it in at the end of the conference. Attendees are made aware of the evaluation at the beginning of the conference and are reminded to complete it during the conference. Participants who do fill out the evaluation, do so voluntarily and anonymously. The evaluation form is **part** of the information packet given to conference attendees upon registration at the beginning of each conference. During the opening session attendees are made aware of this evaluation form and encouraged to complete it. This reminder is made periodically throughout the event.

#### c. Assessment plans

Conferences assessments are performed through the following peer review methods:

- Demographic assessments; all conference attendees are requested to provide CSA with applicable demographic information including area of expertise, time in occupation, acres farmed or landscapes managed, experience with sustainable practices, and how they heard of the event. This information is used to evaluate the effectiveness of outreach to target audiences, to determine the informational needs of diverse audiences, and to plan effective outreach and programs for future educational programs.
- Assessments of conference content; registrants, speakers, facilitators, growers, business representatives, and volunteers are asked to rate individual speakers and topics, the usefulness of presentations and tours, and if applicable their intention to adopt technologies and methods presented in the program (see Conference Evaluation Form). This information is used to assess conference content, timeliness, and effectiveness, and to plan future events that will meet the educational needs of the geographical area being served.
- Conference resourcing; 1) all conference attendees are listed in a participants directory which is available to interested individuals, organizations, and businesses for networking and resource accessibility, 2) conference demographic information, survey summaries, materials and resource information generated through these conferences are made available to interested individuals, organizations, and businesses upon request, 3) conference survey respondents' contact information is assembled to allow follow-up on comments and suggestions. These conference resources provide valuable networking tools for other educational programs in conservation.
- Outreach through media coverage and printed copy; all announcements, newspaper articles, and conference advertising are included in the final funders' report to assess outreach effectiveness.

#### d. Data handling

The data from the conference evaluation forms are entered into a statistical database and verified for accuracy by a research analyst. The final evaluation summary presents the descriptive statistics and transcribed comments. A summary report will be mailed to CALFED, the speakers, and sponsors of the event.

#### e. Expected products

The deliverables will include:

Program brochure, including speakers, titles of talks, venue and times; Copies of all public outreach materials; Participants packets; Sponsorship Packet; Participants directory; Conference evaluations; Media coverage; A list of new adaptive management strategies for future conferences; A report on the proposed adaptive management approach that incorporates our successes of sustainable agriculture and landscaping outreach into the CALFED program strategies; and a Summary analysis.

#### **f. Work schedule**

This section describes activities to be completed for four one-day conferences and tours per year for two years. The model for each conference assumes a four month planning and production cycle and delineates activity tasks, a timeline, and deliverables where applicable. Conferences and Tours for all events are proposed for November 2000 to October 2002.

##### Month I

**Task 1** - In cooperation with CALFED, and the planning committees composed of local associations, agencies and community members: examine hypotheses, assess feasibility of objective, and refine as needed, draft and approve initial conference programs; identify potential plenary sessions, workshops, tours, speakers, venues, and schedules.

**Task 2** - Identify potential businesses for sponsorship participation. Send sponsor packet including cover letter, outline of sponsorship program with participation levels, and draft of venue.

##### Month II

**Task 3** - Contact potential speakers, farmers, facilitators and agricultural professionals for speaking engagements.

**Task 4** - Compile and prepare a relevant mailing list based on geographic and technical parameters, including but not limited to vocation, type of grower, and location.

**Task 5** - Design, produce and print conference flyer/brochure to be mailed to above lists and distributed to points of contact for advance outreach.

##### Month III

**Task 6** - Mail flyers to distribution lists and points of contact.

**Task 7** - Secure Continuing Education Units as applicable.

**Task 8** - Distribute press releases, public service announcements, community calendars, bulletin boards and other forms of public information.

**Task 9** - Work with local media and environmental organizations for public outreach via newsprint bulletins, electronic coverage, and on-line services (ongoing).

##### Month IIII

**Task 10** - Work with institution/venue hosts, caterers, logistical support, and business sponsors for conference and tour production.

**Task 11** - Process advanced registrations and send confirmation letters (ongoing).

**Task 12** - Perform scholarship outreach to disadvantaged constituencies

##### Month IV

**Task 13** - Produce participant packets.

##### **Convene Event**

**Task 14** - Perform post-conference evaluations and wrap-up.

#### **g. Feasibility**

The schedule is feasible and appropriate. CSA's years of experience in producing events will ensure that the conferences are held on time. No allowances need to be made for weather, timing of other projects, environmental compliance or permitting.

## **D. APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND CVPIA PRIORITIES**

### **1. ERP goals and CVPIA priorities**

Habitat for spawning San Joaquin fall-run chinook and white sturgeon can be improved by the implementation of newly learned sustainable landscape practices in Stanislaus County, and winegrape conservation strategies in Madera and Fresno Counties. Habitat for steelhead in the Napa River can improve with winegrape growers implementing erosion control techniques. All sensitive species in the delta, and in the above listed areas, can experience increased lifespan and improved fecundity as land managers implement biointensive IPM and nutrient management practices. Growers and landscapers who adapt sustainable management will work within the biological natural system, which in turn, will encourage diversity within the entire ecosystem.

### **2. Relationship to other ecosystem restoration projects**

The proposed conferences will complement previously funded CALFED projects in these affected ecozones, including: the Napa Watershed Stewardship program, the South Napa River Tidal Slough and Floodplain Restoration Project, and the Merced River Corridor Restoration Project. Representatives from these efforts will be encouraged to speak at the events, presenting their successes and findings. Additionally, staff from these projects will be invited to participate in pre-planning conference sessions, and will receive conference evaluations summaries and participants directories to assist their Conservation efforts.

### **3. Requests for next-phase funding**

This is not a request for next-phase funding.

### **4. Previous recipients of CALFED or CVPIA funding**

CALFED funded CSA to produce the "Environmental Education Conferences and Field Tours" in 1998. The CALFED number is 9-FC-20-00010. These educational forums were tremendously successful. More than 100 participants attended the Modesto Soil Fertility and Pest Management Conference in February 1999, and 76 participants attended the Modesto Livestock and Dairy Conference in June 1999. Ninety percent of survey respondents indicated that they intended to use what they learned at these events to help protect the natural resources of the San Joaquin Watershed area. A full report was sent in July 1999.

Since CALFED funded the above mentioned conferences in 1998, CSA has received funding from USDA Environmental Quality Education Program to expand these conservation education efforts in soil fertility and livestock and dairy production for the years 2000 and 2001. CALFED's initial seed money has allowed CSA to build the conservation ethic in the bioregion. Strong working relationships with farmers and influential agricultural consultants, and support of local businesses has been established. CALFED funding for winegrape production and landscape management will provide the foundation to address high-impact issues of these burgeoning industries.

### **5. System-wide ecosystem benefits**

CSA will work with other organizations to augment their successes. The Napa Sustainable Winegrape Growing Group and the Community Alliance with Family Farmers are promoting conservation practices through small grower meetings. CALFED funded conferences will enhance their efforts by being able to bring renown speakers in from distance locations and attract and address a large section of the community. Speakers from other CALFED projects will be able to present on topics particular to the

conference's ecozones, increasing public understanding of the resource issues that led to the development of the CALFED Bay-Delta program.

## **E. QUALIFICATIONS**

Project Coordinator:

Jo Ann Baumgartner, CSA Sustainable Agriculture Program Director

Jo Ann Baumgartner has directed CSA's Sustainable Agriculture Program conferences and tours since 1997, including the previous project with CALFED. She consults with Sunflower Strategies on a Water Quality Initiative for the Pajaro Valley, and the Organic Materials Review Institute, and periodically is the staff assistant for a UCSC Integrated Pest Management class. Jo Ann worked as assistant director and research coordinator for the Sustainable Cotton Project for four years, and with BioSystems for two years as a research editor for "Life on the Edge," a book about threatened and endangered wildlife in California. She is on the board of directors of CSA, and is a member of the Association of Applied Insect Ecologists. Her experience includes managing an organic farm that had minimal off-site water quality impacts for 15 years in Santa Cruz County. She has recently published work with beneficial bird species in apple orchards. Jo Ann received a BS. in Soil and Water Science from UC Davis, and a MS. in Environmental Studies from San Jose State University.

Contract Manager:

Lynn Young, CSA Executive Director

Lynn Young has directed CSA for three years, including supervision of budgets, programs, and personnel. She has administered CSA contracts with CALFED, California Integrated Waste Management Board, the US Environmental Protection Agency, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and other government and nonprofit entities. Lynn has acted as consultant in board development, fundraising, and program and volunteer management for the Volunteer Centers of Santa Cruz County, Legal Aid Society, California Coastal Commission, the Hunger Relief Project, and other NGO's. She holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Public Administration, and is a Master of Nonprofit Administration candidate at the University of San Francisco.

The Committee for Sustainable Agriculture (CSA) is a non-profit 501(c)3 organization that promotes environmentally sound farming practices. Since its founding in 1980 CSA has been a leader in presenting agricultural information and practices that preserve natural resources and protect human health and the environment. During the last 20 years, more than 21,000 participants have attended CSA educational programs. CSA is recognized as an educational organization by the Department of Pesticide Regulation, Certified Crop Advisors Program, and the International Society of Arboriculture.

## **F. COST**

### **1. Budget**

The proposed funding request for one conference is \$12,125, and for four events in two years is \$97,000. Each conference for each year may be considered and funded as an independent project. The attached budget reflects per-conference costs.

### **2. Cost-sharing**

No cost-sharing funds are committed at this time. CSA has budgeted \$1,500 income per event for farm and landscape business sponsorships and registration fees (\$25/person) at the conferences. As with previous CALFED-funded conferences, considerable in-kind contributions will be made by other agriculture organizations, experts presenters, and

hosts at tour sites. Additionally, CSA will work to find organizations in the different counties to donate venue space for the conferences.

### **G. Local involvement**

The four conferences and tours will be produced in cooperation with local representatives of the Napa Resource Conservation District, the Napa Sustainable Winegrape Growing Group, the Napa Valley Vintner's Association, the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Madera/Fresno Counties, California Clean Growers, the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Stanislaus County, Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF), the California Integrated Waste Management Board, and independent consultants, local farmers, and local landscape professionals compose CSAs advisory committees. These organizations and individuals provide in-kind contributions in their respective areas for the following:

- 1) examine hypotheses and objective of project, and refine as needed
- 2) expertise in current conservation issues and practices
- 3) recommendations of local speakers and tour sites of farms using best management practices
- 4) educational materials and supporting technical assistance
- 5) constituency outreach through mailing lists and announcements in newsletters.

CSAs 20 years of experience and prior collaborations combine to leverage additional support for CALFED's funding. Further assistance in the form of expertise, contacts, services, and public outreach may be requested of UC Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program, UC Small Farm Center, the US Environmental Protection Agency, local universities and colleges, agricultural commissioners, farm bureaus, and commodity boards.

These conferences are designed to complement and enhance a variety of programs that promote environmentally sound agriculture practices, including CALFED, CAFF Lighthouse, and BIOS Programs. With CALFED's assistance, these workshops and tours will present comprehensive topic-specific educational tools that can be used as an informational foundation by farmers, landscape professionals, agricultural advisors and businesses during their ongoing conservation efforts.

### **H. Compliance with standard terms and conditions**

The Committee for Sustainable Agriculture is prepared to comply with **all** standard terms and conditions of this grant.

### **I. Literature cited**

American Crop Protection Association. 1996. Industry profile: 1995, compiled by Association Services Group, LLC, American Crop Protection Association, Washington, D.C. In Benbrook, C., E. Groth, J. Halloran, M. Hansen, S. Marquardt. Pest Management at the Crossroads. Yonkers: Consumers Union, 1996.

Bailey, H.C., J.L. Miller, M.J. Miller, L.C. Wiborg, L. Deanovic, and T. Shed. 1997. Joint acute toxicity of diazinon and chlorpyrifos to *Ceriodaphnia dubia*. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 16(11):2304-2308.

Benbrook, C., E. Groth, J. Halloran, M. Hansen, S. Marquardt. Pest Management at the Crossroads. Yonkers: Consumers Union, 1996.

California Department of Pesticide Regulation website, [www.cdpr.ca.gov](http://www.cdpr.ca.gov)

California Oak Newsletter. 2000. Department of Fish and Game's strategy for conserving oak woodlands in vineyard landscapes, January.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Insecticide Concentrations and Invertebrate Bioassay Mortality in Agricultural Return Water from the San Joaquin Basin,. 1995.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Bioassay Reports, 1990 & 1995.

Davis, J.R., R.C. Brownson, R. Garcia, B.J. Bentz, A. Turner. "Family Pesticide Use and Childhood Brain Cancer." Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 1993, pp. 87 - 92.

Debach, P. and D. Rosen. Biological control by natural enemies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Fenske, R.A., K.G. Black, K.P. Elkner, Chong-li Lee, M.M. Methner, R. Soto. "Potential Exposure and Health Risks of Infants following Indoor Residential Pesticide Applications," American Journal of Public Health, 1990, June, vol. 80, no. 8, p. 689

Foe, C. 1995. Insecticide Concentrations and Invertebrate Bioassay Mortality in Agricultural Return Water from the San Joaquin Basin, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento, CA. Staff Report.

Greir, A., E. Clough, and A. Clewell. 1994. Toxic water: A report on the adverse effects of pesticides on the Pacific Coho Salmon and the prevalence of pesticides in Coho habitat. Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides, Eugene, Oregon.

Harris, T. Death in the Marsh. Washington: Island Press, 1991.

Leiss, J.K., and D.A. Savitz. "Home Pesticide Use and Childhood Cancer: A Case-Control Study," American Journal of Public Health, 1995, vol. 85, pp. 249 - 252.

Mayer, F. and M. Ellersieck. 1986. Manual of acute toxicity: Interpretation and data base for 410 chemicals and 66 species of freshwater animals. Resource publication no. 160, U.S. F.S., Washington, D.C.

Modesto Bee, 3/3 1/98

Modesto Bee, 9/15/97.

Ogle, S., A. Gunther, and R. Hoenicke. 1998. Episodic Toxicity in the San Francisco Bay System. Interagency Ecological Program Newsletter 11(2):14-17.

Pickett, C.H. and R.L. Bugg, eds. Enhancing Biological Control. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1998.

Richardson, L. ed. 2000. Green Storm. California Farmer. March.

Roltshch, W. and R. Hanna, R. Zalom, H. Shorey, M. Mayse. Spiders and vineyard habitat relationships in Central California. In Pickett, C.H. and R.L. Bugg, eds. Enhancing Biological Control. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1998.

SFEI. 1999. 1997 Annual Report for the Regional Monitoring Program for Trace Substances in the San Francisco Estuary. San Francisco Estuary Institute, Richmond, CA.



Thelander, C. ed. Life on the Edge. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1994.

White, J., ed. 1999. UC Scientists study Pierce's disease, vineyard expansion. California Agriculture. Vol. 53, no. 6.


White, J., ed. 1999. Cover description. California Agriculture. Vol. 53, no. 1.

**J. Threshold requirements**


See attachments.



**Figure 1. Conceptual Model: Are Exposure & Knowledge of Farm & landscape Conservation Practices limiting Factors?**



**Figure 2. Conceptual Model: When & How Farmers & landscape Managers Make Decisions to Change Their Practices**



**Figure 3. Conceptual Model: Removing an Educational Bottleneck**





Figure 4. Conceptual Model: Improving Conference Effectiveness



**F. COST****1. Annual Budget**

This budget reflects per-conference costs.

Task and Project Phase	Direct Labor Hours	Salary	Benefits	Travel	Supplies	Service Contracts	Overhead	TOTAL COSTS
Task 1 Draft Program	28	517	31	150				698
Task 2 Contact Sponsors	10	171	8					178
Task 3 Secure Presenters	75	1,487	109			500		2,096
Task 4 Mailing Lists	15	210			50			260
Task 5 Produce Brochure	40	809	62		800			1,671
Task 6 Mail Brochures	2	28			600			628
Task 7 Secure Ed Units	3	61	5					66
Task 8 General Outreach	5	70			100			175
Task 9 Media Outreach (ongoing)	12	242	19					200
Task 10 Event Production	95	1,799	100		100			1,999
Task 11 Process Registrars (ongoing)	40	560	35					595
Task 12 Scholarsh Outreach	5	70						70
Task 13 Produce Participant Packet	15	210			250			460
Convene Event	55	981	23	150	250			2750
Task 14 Conference Evaluation	15	210			50			260
Project Management	60	1,214	94					1,308
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>8,639</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2,200</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,125</b>

### Summary Budget

<b>YEAR ONE</b>		<b>Cost/Event</b>	<b>Cost/Year</b>
<b>Salaries</b>			
Program Coordinator*	\$20.24/hour x 300 hours	\$6,072	\$24,288
Assistant Coordinator	\$14.04/hour x 143 hours	\$2,007	\$8,028
Bookkeeper	\$14.04/hour x 40 hours	\$560	\$2,248
<b>Benefits</b>			
Program Coordinator	\$1.50/hour x 300 hours	\$451	\$1,804
Bookkeeper	\$0.88/hour x 40 hours	\$35	\$140
Travel	1,000 miles x \$0.30 mile	\$300	\$1,200
Supplies **		\$2,200	\$8,800
<b>Service Contracts</b>			
Speakers travel		\$500	\$2,000
<b>Total Cost Year One</b>		<b>\$12,125</b>	<b>\$48,500</b>
<b>YEAR TWO</b>			
<b>Salaries</b>			
Program Coordinator*	\$20.24/hour x 300 hours	\$6,072	\$24,288
Assistant Coordinator	\$14.04/hour x 143 hours	\$2,007	\$8,028
Bookkeeper	\$14.04/hour x 40 hours	\$560	\$2,248
<b>Benefits</b>			
Program Coordinator	\$1.50/hour x 300 hours	\$451	\$1,804
Bookkeeper	\$0.88/hour x 40 hours	\$35	\$140
Travel	1,000 miles x \$0.30 mile	\$300	\$1,200
Supplies **		\$2,200	\$8,800
<b>Service Contracts</b>			
Speakers travel		\$500	\$2,000
<b>Total Cost Year Two</b>		<b>\$12,125</b>	<b>\$48,500</b>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>			<b>\$97,000</b>

\*Sixty of the 300 hours are deemed project management. These duties include periodically assessing work in progress and budget spending, and writing reports.

\*\* Supplies include office supplies.



# BUDGET INFORMATION - Non-Construction Programs

OMB Approval No. 0348-0044

## SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	Total (g)
1.		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. Totals		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

## SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

6. Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY				Total (5)
	(1) YEAR ONE	(2) YEAR TWO	(3)	(4)	
a. Personnel	\$ 38,500	\$ 38,500	\$	\$	\$ 77,000
b. Fringe Benefits	2,250	2,250			4,500
c. Travel	1,100	1,100			2,200
d. Equipment					
e. Supplies	3,400	3,400			6,800
f. Contractual					
g. Construction					
h. Other	9,250	9,250			18,500
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)					
j. Indirect Charges					
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$ 54,500	\$ 54,500	\$	\$	\$ 109,000
7. Program Income	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424A (Rev. 7-97)  
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

**SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES**

(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS
8. <b>YEAR ONE &amp; TWO</b>	\$ 12,000	\$	\$	\$
9.				
10.				
11.				
12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)	(\$12,000	\$	\$	\$

**SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS**

	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	\$ 48,500	\$ 24,250	\$ 24,250	\$	\$
14. Non-Federal					
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$48,500	\$	\$	\$	\$

**SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT**

(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (Years)			
	(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth
16.	\$ 48,500	\$ 48,500	\$	\$
17.				
18.				
19.				
20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16-19)	\$	\$	\$	\$

**SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION**

21. Direct Charges:	22. Indirect Charges:
23. Remarks:	

## Environmental Compliance Checklist

All applicants must fill out this Environmental Compliance Checklist. Applications must contain answers to the following questions to be responsive and to be considered for funding. **Failure to answer these questions and include them with the application will result in the application being considered nonresponsive and not considered for funding.**

1. Do any of the actions included in the proposal require compliance with either the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), or both?

\_\_\_\_\_  
YES

X  
NO

2. If you answered yes to # 1, identify the lead governmental agency for CEQADJEP A compliance.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lead Agency

3. If you answered no to # 1, explain why CEQA/NEPA compliance is not required for the actions in the proposal.

**The proposal is for educational conferences.**

4. If CEQA/NEPA compliance is required, describe how the project will comply with either or both of these laws. Describe where the project is in the compliance process and the expected date of completion.

5. Will the applicant require access across public or private property that the applicant does not own to accomplish the activities in the proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_  
YES

X  
NO

If yes, the applicant must attach written permission for access from the relevant property owner(s). Failure to include written permission for access may result in disqualification of the proposal during the review process. Research and monitoring field projects for which specific field locations have not been identified will be required to provide access needs and permission for access with **30 days of notification of approval.** .

6. Please indicate what permits or other approvals may be required for the activities contained in your proposal. Check all boxes that apply.

**LOCAL**

- Conditional use permit
- Variance
- Subdivision Map Act approval
- Grading permit
- General plan amendment
- Specific plan approval
- Rezone
- Williamson Act Contract cancellation
- Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(please specify)
- None required

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

☒

**STATE**

- CESA Compliance
- Streambed alteration permit
- CWA § 401 certification'
- Coastal development permit
- Reclamation Board approval
- Notification
- Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(please specify)
- None required

\_\_\_\_\_ (CDFG)

\_\_\_\_\_ (CDFG)

\_\_\_\_\_ (RWQCB)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Coastal Commission/BCDC)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (DPC, BCDC)

\_\_\_\_\_

☒

**FEDERAL**

- ESA Consultation
- Rivers & Harbors Act permit
- CWA §404 permit
- Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(please specify)
- None required

\_\_\_\_\_ (USFWS)

\_\_\_\_\_ (ACOE)

\_\_\_\_\_ (ACOE)

\_\_\_\_\_

☒

DPC =Delta Protection Commission

CWA =Clean Water Act

CESA = California Endangered Species Act

USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

ACOE = U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

ESA =Endangered Species Act

CDFG = California Department of Fish and Game

RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board

BCDC= Bay Conservation and Development Comm.

# Land Use Checklist

All applicants must fill out this Land Use Checklist for their proposal. Applications must contain answers to the following questions to be responsive and to be considered for funding. Failure to answer these questions and include them with the application will result in the application being considered nonresponsive and not considered for funding.

1. Do the actions in the proposal involve physical changes to the land (i.e. grading, planting vegetation, or breaching levees) or restrictions in land use (i.e. conservation easement or placement of land in a wildlife refuge)?

            
YES

  X    
NO

2. If NO to # 1, explain what type of actions are involved in the proposal (i.e., research only, planning only).  
educational conferences only

3. If YES to # 1, what is the proposed land use change or restriction under the proposal?

4. If YES to # 1, is the land currently under a Williamson Act contract?

            
YES

            
NO

5. If YES to # 1, answer the following:

Current land use

Current zoning

Current general plan designation

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6. If YES to #1, is the land classified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland on the Department of Conservation Important Farmland Maps?

            
YES

            
NO

            
DON'T KNOW

7. If YES to # 1, how many acres of land will be subject to physical change or land use restrictions under the proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_

8. If YES to # 1, is the property currently being commercially farmed or grazed?

            
YES

            
NO

9. If YES to #8, what are

the number of employees/acre \_\_\_\_\_

the total number of employees \_\_\_\_\_

10. Will the applicant acquire any interest in land under the proposal (fee title **or** a conservation easement)?

        
YES

  X    
NO

11. What entity/organization will hold the interest? \_\_\_\_\_

12. If YES to # 10, answer the following:

Total number of acres to be acquired under proposal \_\_\_\_\_

Number of acres *to* be acquired in fee \_\_\_\_\_

Number of acres to be subject to conservation easement \_\_\_\_\_

13. For all proposals involving physical changes to the land **or** restriction in **land** use, describe what entity **or** organization will:

manage the property \_\_\_\_\_

provide operations and maintenance semces \_\_\_\_\_

conduct monitoring \_\_\_\_\_

14. For land acquisitions (fee title **or** easements), will existing water rights also be acquired?

        
YES

  X    
NO

15. Does the applicant propose any modifications to the water right **or** change in the delivery of the water?.

        
YES

  X    
NO

16. If YES to # 15, describe \_\_\_\_\_

**ASSURANCES- NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS**

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.


**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.**

**NOTE** Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency; the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and. (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this, award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL		TITLE	
 LYNN YOUNG		EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION		DATE SUBMITTED	
COMMITTEE FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE		5-12-2000	



U.S. Department of the Interior

Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension and  
Other Responsibility Matters, Drug-Free Workplace  
Requirements and Lobbying

Persons signing this form should refer to the regulations referenced below for complete instructions:

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters - Primary Covered Transactions - The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled, "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. See below for language to be used; use this form for certification and sign; or use Department of the Interior Form 1954 (DI-1954). [See Appendix A of Subpart D of 43 CFR Part 12.]

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions - [See Appendix B of Subpart D of 43 CFR Part 12.]

Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements - Alternate I. (Grantees Other Than Individuals) and Alternate II. (Grantees Who are Individuals) - (See Appendix C of Subpart D of 43 CFR Part 12.)

Signature on this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 43 CFR Parts 12 and 18. The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of the Interior determines to award the covered transaction, grant, cooperative agreement or loan.

PART A: Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters -  
Primary Covered Transactions

CHECK ☒ IF THIS CERTIFICATION IS FOR A PRIMARY COVERED TRANSACTION AND IS APPLICABLE.


- (1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:
- (a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;
  - (b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;
  - (c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and
  - (d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.
- (2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

PART B: Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion -  
Lower Tier Covered Transactions

CHECK ☐ IF THIS CERTIFICATION IS FOR A LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTION AND IS APPLICABLE.

- (1) The prospective lower tier Participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

DI-2010  
March 1995  
(This form consolidates DI-1953, DI-1954,  
DI-1955, DI-1956 and DI-1963)

  
LYNN YOUNG  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / CSA

---

**PART C:** Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements

---

CHECK ☒ IF THIS CERTIFICATION IS FOR AN APPLICANT WHO IS NOT AN INDIVIDUAL.

Alternate I. (Grantees Other Than Individuals)

A. The grantee certifies that it will or continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

- (a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;
- (b) Establishing an ongoing drug-free awareness program to inform employees about--
  - (1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
  - (2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
  - (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
  - (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;
- (c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph 1a;
- (d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will --
  - (1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
  - (2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;
- (e) Notifying the agency in writing, within ten calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer on whose grant activity the convicted employee was working, unless the Federal agency has designated a central point for the receipt of such notices. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;
- (f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted --
  - (1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
  - (2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;
- (g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the Performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

COMMITTEE FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE  
406 MAIN STREET, # 313  
WATSONVILLE, CA 95076

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

 LYNN YOUNG  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / CSA

---

**PART D:** Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements

---

CHECK ☐ IF THIS CERTIFICATION IS FOR AN APPLICANT WHO IS AN INDIVIDUAL.

Alternate II. (Grantees Who Are Individuals)

- (a) The grantee certifies that, as a condition of the grant, he or she will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant;
- (b) If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, he or she will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to the grant officer or other designee, unless the Federal agency designates a central point for the receipt of such notices. When notice is made to such a central point, it shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

---

PART E: Certification Regarding Lobbying  
Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

---

~~CHECK — IF CERTIFICATION IS FOR THE AWARD OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AND THE AMOUNT EXCEEDS \$100,000: A FEDERAL GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT, SUBCONTRACT, OR SUBGRANT UNDER THE GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.~~

~~CHECK ☐ IF CERTIFICATION IS FOR THE AWARD OF A FEDERAL LOAN EXCEEDING THE AMOUNT OF \$150,000. OR A SUBGRANT OR SUBCONTRACT EXCEEDING \$100,000. UNDER THE LOAN.~~


The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

- (1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, and officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
- (2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
- (3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by Section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

As the authorized certifying official, I hereby certify that the above specified certifications are true.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL



TYPED NAME AND TITLE

Lynn Young, Executive Director

DATE May 12, 2000

Agreement No. \_\_\_\_\_

Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDITIONAL STANDARD CLAUSES**

Recycled Materials. Contractor hereby certifies under penalty of perjury that NA (enter value or "0" here) percent of the materials, goods and supplies offered or products used in the performance of this Agreement meets or exceeds the minimum percentage of recycled material as defined in Sections 12161 and 12200 of the Public Contract Code.


Severability. If any provision of this Agreement is held invalid or unenforceable by any court of final jurisdiction, it is the intent of the parties that all other provisions of this Agreement be construed to remain fully valid, enforceable, and binding on the parties.

Governing Law. This Agreement is governed by and shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

Y2K Language. The Contractor warrants and represents that the goods or services sold, leased, or licensed to the State of California, its agencies, or its political subdivisions, pursuant to this Agreement are "Year 2000 compliant." For purposes of this Agreement a good or service is Year 2000 compliant if it will continue to fully function before, at, and after the Year 2000 without interruption and, if applicable, with full ability to accurately and unambiguously process, display, compare, calculate, manipulate, and otherwise utilize date information. This warranty and representation supersedes all warranty disclaimers and limitations and all limitations on liability provided by or through the Contractor.

Child Support Compliance Act. For any Agreement in excess of \$100,000, the Contractor acknowledges in accordance therewith, that:

1. The Contractor recognizes the importance of child and family support obligations and shall fully comply with all applicable state and federal laws relating to child and family support enforcement, including, but not limited to, disclosure of information and compliance with earnings assignment orders, as provided in Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 5200) of Part 5 of Division 9 of the Family Code; and
2. The Contractor, to the best of its knowledge, is fully complying with the earnings assignment orders of all employees and is providing the names of all new employees to the New Hire Registry maintained by the California Employment Development Department.

  
LYNN YOUNG  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / CSA